

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION**

EURICK T. ROSE #1625079

V.

**JAMES R. WILSON,
LT. WILLIAMS and OTHER SHIFT
WORKER**

§
§
§
§
§
§

A-10-CA-807-SS

**AMENDED REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE¹**

TO: THE HONORABLE SAM SPARKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Magistrate Judge submits this Amended Report and Recommendation to the District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b) and Rule 1(f) of Appendix C of the Local Court Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrates, as amended, effective December 1, 2002.

Before the Court is Plaintiff's amended complaint. Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

At the time he filed his amended complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Plaintiff was confined in the Holliday Unit of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Correctional Institutions Division. Plaintiff alleges he was previously confined in the Williamson County Jail where he slipped and fell at the shower. Plaintiff complains there was no mat in the shower, causing him to slip. According to Plaintiff, he suffered a concussion and experienced pain in his lower back

¹ Plaintiff filed an amended complaint after the Court issued its original Report and Recommendation. This Amended Report and Recommendation addresses Plaintiff's amended complaint.

and neck and numbness in his legs. Plaintiff asserts he still is having lower back problems. Plaintiff seeks an unspecified amount of monetary damages. He sues Sheriff James R. Wilson, Lieutenant Williams and an unidentified shift worker.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

A. Standard Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

An in forma pauperis proceeding may be dismissed sua sponte under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if the court determines the complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from suit. A dismissal for frivolousness or maliciousness may occur at any time, before or after service of process and before or after the defendant's answer. Green v. McKaskle, 788 F.2d 1116, 1119 (5th Cir. 1986).

When reviewing a plaintiff's complaint, the court must construe plaintiff's allegations as liberally as possible. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 92 S. Ct. 594 (1972). However, the petitioner's pro se status does not offer him "an impenetrable shield, for one acting pro se has no license to harass others, clog the judicial machinery with meritless litigation and abuse already overloaded court dockets." Ferguson v. MBank Houston, N.A., 808 F.2d 358, 359 (5th Cir. 1986).

B. Personal Injury Claims

As explained in the Court's original Report and Recommendation, a plaintiff may maintain a civil rights suit only if he can show an abuse of government power that rises to a constitutional level. Love v. King, 784 F.2d 708, 712 (5th Cir. 1986); Williams v. Kelley, 624 F.2d 695, 697 (5th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 451 U.S. 1019, 101 S. Ct. 3009 (1981). The Supreme Court has held that many acts that might constitute a violation of state tort law do not amount to constitutional violations. Baker v. McCollan, 443 U.S. 137, 146, 99 S. Ct. 2689, 2695-96 (1979). See also, Lewis

v. Woods, 848 F.2d 649, 651 (5th Cir. 1988). It is well settled that negligence on the part of jail officials does not give rise to civil rights claims. Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327, 106 S. Ct. 662 (1986); Marsh v. Jones, 53 F.3d 707, 712 (5th Cir. 1995); Simmons v. Poppell, 837 F.2d 1243, 1244 (5th Cir. 1988). In Daniels, the Supreme Court held that claims originating from a jailer leaving a pillow on the floor and a prisoner slipping and falling over the pillow constitutes a state tort claim for negligence and does not amount to a civil rights claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To the extent Plaintiff complains of his slip and fall, Plaintiff's allegations at most amount to a state claim of negligence, which are not cognizable under § 1983, and which must be filed in state court.

RECOMMENDATION

It is therefore recommended that Plaintiff's amended complaint be dismissed with prejudice as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

It is further recommended that the Court include within its judgment a provision expressly and specifically warning Plaintiff that filing or pursuing any further frivolous lawsuits may result in (a) the imposition of court costs pursuant to Section 1915(f); (b) the imposition of significant monetary sanctions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 11; (c) the imposition of an order barring Plaintiff from filing any lawsuits in this Court without first obtaining the permission from a District Judge of this Court or a Circuit Judge of the Fifth Circuit; or (d) the imposition of an order imposing some combination of these sanctions.

It is further recommended that Plaintiff should be warned that for causes of action which accrue after June 8, 1995, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, upon receipt of a final order of a state or federal court that dismisses as frivolous or malicious a lawsuit brought by an inmate while the inmate was in the custody of the Department or confined in county jail awaiting transfer

to the Department following conviction of a felony or revocation of community supervision, parole, or mandatory supervision, is authorized to forfeit (1) 60 days of an inmate's accrued good conduct time, if the Department has previously received one final order; (2) 120 days of an inmate's accrued good conduct time, if the Department has previously received two final orders; or (3) 180 days of an inmate's accrued good conduct time, if the Department has previously received three or more final orders. See, TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 498.0045 (Vernon 1998).

It is further recommended that Plaintiff should be warned that if Plaintiff files more than three actions or appeals while he is a prisoner which are dismissed as frivolous or malicious or for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted, then he will be prohibited from bringing any other actions in forma pauperis unless he is in imminent danger of serious physical injury. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).


OBJECTIONS

Within 14 days after receipt of the magistrate judge's report, any party may serve and file written objections to the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C). Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations contained within this report within 14 days after service shall bar an aggrieved party from de novo review by the district court of the proposed findings and recommendations and from appellate review of factual findings accepted or adopted by the district court except on grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Assoc., 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996)(en banc); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 148 (1985); Rodriguez v. Bowen, 857 F.2d 275, 276-277 (5th Cir. 1988).

To the extent that a party has not been served by the Clerk with this Report and Recommendation electronically, pursuant to the CM/ECF procedures of this District, the Clerk is

ORDERED to mail such party a copy of this Report and Recommendation by certified mail, return receipt requested.

SIGNED this 22nd day of November, 2010.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Austin", is written over a horizontal line.

ANDREW W. AUSTIN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE